

REMARKS

With respect to the rejection of claims 47, 48, 50-56 and 58-62 under the enabling requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 it is respectfully submitted that the conditions 1-5 specified at pages 26 and 27 of the specification are not inconsistent. The only condition requiring de-energization of the loop sensors is condition number 1. In the other conditions the loop sensors are not disabled. Therefore the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendments, the rejection of claims 25-28, 32, 36 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a); the rejection of claims 29, 33, 37 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a); the rejection of claims 30, 31, 34, 35, 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a); and the rejection of claim 57 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 63/25, 32, 36 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), now claims 25, 32, 36 and 46 as being unpatentable over WILLIAMS and KAISER and further in view of CLARK (937), is improper for the following reasons.

In the claimed electronic parking meter system the microprocessor controller includes a crystal oscillator which controls a variable oscillator circuit and the presence or absence of a vehicle in the parking place causes a respective decrease or increase in the inductance of the inductance loop which results in a commensurate increase or decrease in the operating frequency and a respective decrease or increase in the variable oscillator circuit which decreases or increases the number of crystal oscillator pulses in each period of the variable oscillator circuit.

In contradistinction thereto the induction loop vehicle detector circuit of CLARK (937) uses a microprocessor to monitor the oscillation frequency of an oscillator circuit and controls the switching of the capacitors to periodically return the frequency to a predetermined value. Thus the reference fails to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter of these claims.

It is respectfully submitted that as all of the claims in the application depend from parent claims 25, 32, 36, 42 and 46 that all of the claims remaining in the application are patentable and should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Potter et al.

By 
R. J. Lasker, Esq. 22785

Suite 900

1199 North Fairfax Street

Alexandria, Va. 22306

Tel. #(703) 739-4900